



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,150	08/31/2000	Kazuhiko Hoshino	SON-1894	2607
7590	04/18/2006		EXAMINER	
Ronald P. Kananen, Esq. RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER The Lion Building 1233 20th Street, N.W., Suite 501 Washington, DC 20036			HERNANDEZ, NELSON D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
			DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/652,150	HOSHINO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Nelson D. Hernandez	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 12-20 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 12-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 28, 2006 has been entered.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. The Examiner acknowledges the amended claims filed on March 28, 2006. Claims 1-11 have been canceled. Claims 12-20 have been newly added.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 12-14, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, JP 11-191865 in view of Murano, US Patent 5,617,131.**

**Regarding claim 12,** Suzuki discloses an optical system (See fig. 1) having an optical module, the optical module comprising: a substrate (Fig. 1: 18) including a wiring board (circuit board), a through-hole extending through the plate and the wiring board (Fig. 1 teaches a through hole for exposing the CCD 12); an optical element (CCD 12 as shown in fig. 1) mounted to the wiring board, the optical element including a light receiving portion, the wiring board being between the optical element and the plate (See fig. 1); and a lens unit (Fig. 1: 17) mounted to the substrate, the lens unit including a lens (See fig. 1), wherein the light receiving portion and the lens are disposed along an optical axis, the optical axis extending through the through-hole (Fig. 1 teaches that the light receiving portion and the lens are disposed along an optical axis, the optical axis extending through the through-hole) (See translation page 3, ¶ 0011)

Suzuki does not explicitly disclose that the substrate includes a plate of a first material adhered to a wiring board of a material other than the first material, a through-hole extending through the plate and the wiring board and that the lens unit is mounted to the plate so that the plate being between the wiring board and the lens unit.

However, Murano teaches the use of a plate (Fig. 3: 9c) of a first material (metal) adhered to the wiring board (substrate 2 as shown in fig. 3) of a material (i.e. alumina, silica, calcia and magnesia, see col. 4, line 63 – col. 5, line 9) different from the first material in order to separate the wiring board and the imaging array (Fig. 3: 3) from the other elements of the image device (i.e. lens 9 and other substrates 4; see figs. 3 and 5). Murano also teaches that the imaging array may be an LED, a CCD or EL (See col. 3, lines 16-20; col. 11, lines 39-45) (Col. 3, lines 16-50; col. 4, line 63 – col. 5, line 28;

col. 5, line 64 – col. 6, line 50). Having a metal plate adhered to the substrate is advantageous because it would reinforce the substrate in order to prevent fissure or crack from occurrence to the optical system.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Suzuki in view of Murano as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Suzuki by having a plate of a first material adhered to a wiring board of a material other than the first material, a through-hole extending through the plate and the wiring board and that the lens unit is mounted to the plate so that the plate being between the wiring board and the lens unit. The motivation to do so would have been to reinforce the substrate in order to prevent fissure or crack from occurrence to the optical system as suggested by Murano (Col. 6, lines 45-50).

**Regarding claim 13,** the combined teaching of Suzuki in view of Murano as applied to claim 12 teaches that the lens is mounted to a lens barrel (See Suzuki, fig. 1: 16) but fails to teach the lens barrel being moveable in a direction along the optical axis.

However, Official Notice is taken that the use of lens barrels being moveable along the optical axis of an optical module is notoriously well known to perform different functions (i.e. focusing, depth of field adjustment, etc) in the art and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Suzuki by having a lens barrel moveable along the optical axis. The motivation to do so would have been to increase the efficiency of the optical system by allowing adjustment of focusing or depth of field of the optical element.

**Regarding claim 14,** limitations can be found in claim 12.

**Regarding claim 19,** claim 19 is analyzed and discussed with respect to claim 12. Grounds for rejecting claim 12 apply here.

**Regarding claim 20,** the combined teaching of Suzuki in view of Murano teaches a camera system using a camera module comprising the optical system according to claim 12 (the optical system in Suzuki and Murano is to be used in a camera using the optical system discussed as in claim 12). Grounds for rejecting claim 12 apply here.

**5. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, JP 11-191865 in view of Murano, US Patent 5,617,131 and further in view of Mochizuki, US Patent 5,777,335.**

**Regarding claim 15,** the combined teaching of Suzuki in view of Murano fails to teach that the optical element includes a shielding layer, the light receiving portion being between the shielding layer and the lens.

However, Mochizuki discloses a solid photographing apparatus (See figs. 2 and 9), comprising: a photographic element (Fig. 2: 1) having an upper face with a light receiving portion and an opposing lower face; a circuit board (Fig. 1: 7) having a circuit board upper face and a circuit board lower face; said circuit board upper face defines a recessed portion having an inner surface with a light blocking shield (Fig. 2: 30(5)) disposed thereon (See fig. 2, the wiring 11 forms the recessed portion of the circuit board); and said photographing element being mounted in said recessed portion with said lower face being shielded from light passing through said circuit board lower face by said light blocking shield and said photographing element being electrically

connected to said circuit board (using wiring shown in fig. 2: 11) (Col. 3, lines 21-51; col. 4, lines 25-40). Having a shielding layer is advantageous because it would help preventing external scattering of radiation to the unwanted locations and the scattering of radiation outside the apparatus, and also, the generation of noises derived from such scattering.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Suzuki in view of Murano and further in view of Mochizuki as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the optical system by having a shielding layer, the light receiving portion being between the shielding layer and the lens. The motivation to do so would have been to improve the optical system efficiency by preventing external scattering of radiation to the unwanted locations and the scattering of radiation outside the apparatus, and also, the generation of noises derived from such scattering as suggested by Mochizuki (Col. 2, lines 6-10; col. 3, lines 40-47).

**Regarding claim 16,** the combined teaching of Suzuki in view of Murano and further in view of Mochizuki as applied to claim 15 teaches that the shielding layer is a metal layer (See Mochizuki, col. 4, lines 25-40; col. 5, lines 19-23).

**6. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, JP 11-191865 and Murano, US Patent 5,617,131 in view of Mochizuki, US Patent 5,777,335 and further in view of Fujieda, US Patent 6,011,860.**

**Regarding claim 17,** the combined teaching of Suzuki in view of Murano and further in view of Mochizuki fails to teach that the shielding layer is a resin layer.

However, Fujieda teaches that the use resin for the shielding layer (Fig. 3: 21, note that the hole casing is made with resin for blocking light) is notoriously well known in the art as an alternative for preventing light or radiation to reach the light receiving portion (Fig. 3: 26) (Col. 5, lines 19-40).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Suzuki and Murano in view of Mochizuki and further in view of Fujieda as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the optical system by having a shielding layer made with resin. The motivation to do so would have been to improve the optical system efficiency by preventing external scattering of light to the unwanted locations and the scattering of light outside the apparatus, and also, the generation of noises derived from such scattering using a material different from metal as a matter of design choice.

**Regarding claim 18,** the combined teaching of Suzuki and Murano in view of Mochizuki and further in view of Fujieda as applied to claim 17 teaches that a portion of the resin layer is in contact with the wiring board (See Mochizuki, figs. 1 and 2, the shielding layer 5 is in contact with the substrate 3).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson D. Hernandez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7311. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M..

Art Unit: 2622

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nelson D. Hernandez  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2622

NDHH  
April 12, 2006



LIN YE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER